

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Joel Marvin Munt, Plaintiff, v. Nanette Larson, et al., Defendants.	Case No. 15-cv-582 (SRN/SER) ORDER
---	--

Joel Marvin Munt, Bayport, MN, pro se.

Timothy S. Christensen, Minnesota Attorney General's Office, 445 Minnesota Street,
Suite 900, St. Paul, MN 55101, for Defendants.

SUSAN RICHARD NELSON, United States District Judge

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Joel Marvin Munt's February 8, 2017 Letter to District Judge [Doc. No. 179] (received February 13, 2017) objecting to Magistrate Judge Steven E. Rau's January 13, 2017 Order [Doc. No. 178] ("Extension Order"), which granted Munt an additional four weeks to respond to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. No. 140]. Munt contends that the extension was "completely without meaning," because the Extension Order did not reach him until January 20, 2017, and because prison rules mean that three weeks are required just to complete printing of the documents he intends to file as his response to the summary judgment motion. (*See* Letter to District Judge at 1.) The combined effect of these delays, Munt argues, is to effectively consume the entirety of the extension period, thus

preventing him from actually profiting from the extension to conduct additional research, writing, etc. (*Id.*)

The Court recognizes that Munt's incarceration places special burdens on his ability to promptly reply to certain filings made in this matter. It also recognizes that Munt's objection raises reasonable concerns about the practical value of the Extension Order in light of those special burdens. Motivated—as Judge Rau was—by interests of justice, the Court will thus modify the terms of the Extension Order so as to allow Munt to file his amended response to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment no later than April 6, 2017. This extension grants Munt an additional seven weeks in which to prepare and file his response, which—even accounting for the unavoidable delays identified by Munt in his Letter—should be ample.¹

In all other respects, the Extension Order is left undisturbed. Accordingly, the “Objections to Defendants' Reply” contained in Munt's Letter are improperly filed and will not be considered by the Court at this time. To the extent Munt wishes to present the arguments encompassed by these “objections” to the Court, he must do so in the first instance in his Response to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The Magistrate Judge's January 13, 2017 Order [Doc. No. 178] is **MODIFIED** so as to allow Plaintiff to file his amended response to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment no later than April 6, 2017;
2. In all other respects, the January 13, 2017 Order is **AFFIRMED**; and

¹ On this point, Munt is reminded that while the Court at all times seeks to accommodate reasonable requests for extensions, it cannot so prolong matters as to impinge upon Defendants' own interest in the speedy resolution of this case.

3. Plaintiff's "Objections to Defendants' Reply" contained in his February 8, 2017 Letter to District Judge [Doc. No. 179] are improperly filed and will **NOT** be considered.

Dated: February 16, 2017

s/Susan Richard Nelson
SUSAN RICHARD NELSON
United States District Judge